

LBNL COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP (CAG)

CAG Meeting Summary

Monday, September 13, 2010

7:00 pm – 9:30 pm

North Berkeley Senior Center

CAG Members Present:

LeRoy Blea, Berkeley Community Health Commission

Rebecca Daly, UC Berkeley Student

Marcos Gandara, Community member

William Gilbert, Claremont Elmwood Neighborhood Association (CENA)

Dan Marks, City of Berkeley Planning Department

Carole Schemmerling, Strawberry Creek Watershed Council

Anne Wagley, Community member

Phil Price, LBNL employee

CAG Members Absent:

Mark Berson, Berkeley Chamber of Commerce

Whitney Dotson, Community member

Paul Licht, UC Botanical Garden

Dean Metzger, Berkeleyans for a Livable University Environment (BLUE)

Mark McCleod, Buy Local Berkeley

Elizabeth Stage, Lawrence Hall of Science

Welcome and Introductions

Daniel Iacofano of MIG welcomed CAG members, community members and staff, and provided a brief introduction to the evening's primary topic of discussion: a second campus for LBNL.

Daniel invited a round of introductions, provided an overview of agenda items for the evening, and briefly reviewed the CAG process to date. Daniel welcomed suggestions as to how to improve the process, noting the diverse set of concerns and ideas held by CAG members and other process participants.

Paul Alivisatos announced that the Lab has promoted Horst Simon to Deputy Director of LBNL. Prior to this appointment, Simon served as Associate Lab Director for Computing Sciences.

Update on Currently Proposed and Possible Future Projects

Jerry O'Hearn provided a brief description and overview of the status of seven currently proposed LBNL projects.

Old Town: The Lab is currently in the planning phase this project. Demolition of Old Town buildings is scheduled to take place in fall 2011.

LBL COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP (CAG)

Solar Energy Research Center: This project is currently in design phase. The environmental impact report (EIR) for this project was just published. A public hearing is scheduled for September 23, 2010. Construction is to begin in summer 2010.

Seismic Upgrades: Building 74 is currently in construction. Seismic Phase 2 is in the design process. Seismic Phase 3: has moved out one fiscal year. May begin design FY13

Berkeley Lab Laser Accelerator (BELLA): Construction for this \$26 million project is beginning now.

Computational Research and Theory (CRT) Building: This project is currently in the design phase. The comment period for the draft environmental assessment is occurring through October 2010. While there have been minor changes to building fenestration, the project building itself has not changed since the CEQA process was conducted two years ago.

Bevatron Demolition Update: The building skin has been removed and temporary plastic is in place. Inside, the shielding blocks and the Bevatron itself have been removed. Currently, the Lab is completing a characterization of the concrete foundation and what is below. The building will be taken down by next spring or summer.

LBLN Second Campus

Jim Krupnick, Chief Operating Officer at LBNL, gave a presentation on the early planning process for developing a second campus for LBNL. He discussed the current locations of LBNL facilities, the attributes of an ideal second campus site, and considerations in evaluating potential second sites.

In summary, Mr. Krupnick shared that twenty percent of Lab programs are currently off-site in leased space, located at the following facilities:

- Joint Genome Institute (JGI), Walnut Creek
- National Energy Research Scientific Computing Center (NERSC), Oakland
- Joint BioEnergy Institute (JBEI), Emeryville
- Life Sciences Division (LSD), Berkeley

Co-locating research is a goal of the Lab and is important to achieving optimal operations. From this standpoint, having facilities located on other sites is sub-optimal. At the same time, the Lab and its programs continue to expand, making a second site necessary.

Mr. Krupnick presented an overview of the primary attributes of an ideal second campus site:

- No more than 20 minutes away from Lab
- Adequate size
- Utilities (capacity and availability of renewable supplies)

LBNL COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP (CAG)

- Affordability
- Sustainability
- Accessibility
- Available public transportation
- Amenities near the site
- Community support

The Lab is open to considering possible locations as far north as Richmond and as far south as Alameda. At this point, the only site the Lab is sure to consider is the Richmond Field Station, which is owned by the University of California.

The Lab has not determined what the specific site requirements are. Once it does, it will release a request for proposals (RFP) for suitable second sites. This will likely take place in December. Mr. Krupnick outlined a conceptual process for choosing a second site. The goal is to make a final site selection in the summer 2011. This means that it may be possible to locate at the future site as early as 2015, though this is an unknown.

Mr. Krupnick expressed that until the Lab develops its specific site requirements it will not be possible to tell where the open, viable sites are located. LBNL is beginning this conversation today out of its desire to have an open public process. The Lab desires as much community participation and input as possible.

The Lab is looking for between 750,000 and 2,000,000 square feet. This range is sufficient to meet the Lab's 30-50-year growth projection requirements. This is not the Lab's planned initial space requirement. This is a big range, and it is not clear where the Lab will end up within this range. For comparison purposes, the current site is 1.8 million gross square feet.

The Lab and the CAG will return to this topic as things progress. The Lab will start the site selection process by looking at two to four sites submitted for consideration in response to its request for proposals, and will then choose one site.

CAG/Community Member Questions and Comments

CAG members asked a number of questions and expressed concerns in response to Mr. Krupnick's presentation. The following is a summary of CAG member statements and questions and Lab responses.

- Some community members have expressed a desire for 100 percent of the Lab to move to an alternative location. Is the Lab considering moving?
 - Response: The Lab is thinking about the possible facilities or projects that it wants to build, and is not restricting this second campus to house existing facilities that are currently off-site. The Lab is open to other facilities moving there also. However, the Lab will not be moving off the hill.

LBNL COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP (CAG)

- Another CAG member expressed excitement about the idea of a second campus. The Lab has met its saturation point on the Hill, and she would like to see more of what is there moved.
- If the Lab developed on more stable land, the amount of money being used to fund implementation of structural solutions to re-stabilize buildings on the existing site could be used for science.
- The City of Berkeley is very pleased that the Lab is looking to establish a major second campus. The Planning Department looks forward to meeting with the Lab and the City manager to identify sites in Berkeley that will work.
- Just a second campus is not enough. The community needs to see slow and stop of development on the Hill if the Lab really wants the community's support.
- There are many advantages to working on the hill, especially access to the UC Campus. A great deal of Lab work is done by graduate students. There will be some resistance from within the Lab to moving people off the hill in large numbers. This doesn't mean it should be done, but it won't be easy in terms of internal Lab politics.
- One CAG member opposed moving Lab facilities entirely offsite. Lab accessibility for UC graduate students is important. One of the Lab's strengths is multi-disciplinary research. What consideration is there in terms of how to divide the disciplines between campus sites?
 - Response: Maintaining close connections between disciplines is of critical importance and is also one of the reasons the Director has specified that the second site must be located within 20 minutes of the Lab site. A good transportation system is required. A critical mass at the site will also be important to have the intellectual excitement.
- With respect to research co-location, bright minds can overcome the challenges of a 20-minute trip. Synergies will continue to exist, and off-site locations will not impede good thinking and successful collaborations.
- The major concern should be the impact the Lab will have on the community it relocates to. One of the potential strains is taking a property off the tax-rolls. The Lab will encounter some resistance to this. Looking at land that is already off the tax-rolls may be easier.
 - Response: Mr. Krupnick explained that one of the ideas is to have incubator space so that private companies could conduct profitable research and development on campus. This would help alleviate or mitigate any loss of tax dollars.
- Consider the density and character of second campus development, and the role that a second campus may have in encouraging surrounding development. Community relations around this issue will be important so that people realize that the future second site will likely be an area of significant growth.
- Consider looking to UC San Francisco's Mission Bay campus as a case study for establishing a successful second campus.

- Consider including housing as part of the development or as a component of the plan area, particularly if the Lab establishes a second campus in an area that is already programmed.
- How the campus integrates into the community and presents itself will have a huge impact on economic development. Put careful thought into helping to create a walkable community that remains active at night and on weekends, and making the second campus look and feel as if it is part of the community.
- Limit high security to the core or control access at the buildings. Good examples of this exist.
- It is critical to move or remove facilities using hazardous materials above limits that the State allows. It's both appropriate and necessary for the DOE to comply with related state regulations.
- Address the issue of researcher liability and Lab oversight over visiting researcher activities. How many user facilities are there and who covers liability? These are important issues wherever the Lab is located, and particularly on the Hill.

A Brief Introduction to Boring Logs

Preston Jordan, Lab Geologist with the Earth Sciences Division, announced that, per CAG member requests, all bore log data was now publicly available online, in one place. This includes geotechnical files and data gathered between 1955 and 2009.

Mr. Jordan then provided a brief presentation on how to interpret the bore log data available. He explained that borings taken decades ago were recorded differently than they are today, and shared and described examples.

Because borings are taken by different people and different institutions over time, making data difficult to replicate precisely, logs help with repeatability by showing where and how borings were taken. The narratives and data sections of the logs will show the data, as well as the conclusions made as part of the specific studies.

Mr. Jordan shared and described core samples from Buildings 85A and 85B. These samples were taken to a depth of 250 feet and help determine what was going on with the geology of that place as far back as 12 million years ago.

CAG Questions and Comments

CAG members and members of the public were interested in specific core and geologic data, including 2009 borings taken as part of landslide data collection, and the location of existing springs and springs relative to geologic faults.

One member of the public requested that the discussion of a volcanic caldera in the Lab area be continued in the future. The geology of the Sibley Volcanic Preserve tells us that there were volcanic eruptions near the Berkeley Lab 9.8 million years ago. There are a total of four

known volcanoes, and the Lab is in the volcano area.¹ Daniel suggested that inviting the individuals who authored the related volcanic theories to attend a future meeting would be important to advance understanding and discussion of this issue.

Next Steps

The next CAG meeting will take place on November 8, 2010, from 7:00 pm to 9:30pm at the North Berkeley Senior Center.

The online location of the Lab's Subsurface Data Access site is <https://sites.google.com/a/lbl.gov/berkeley-lab-geotechnical-reports-and-studies/> LBNL and MIG will post a link to the boring logs on the CAG website (www.lbnl-cag.org) for the community to more readily access.

¹ In response, Mr. Jordan stated that there is no volcanic caldera in the Berkeley Lab area. Data suggesting otherwise could be from a landslide rock that immigrated to the area, but it is not local rock. Data shows topography in the area that may look like a curved caldera shape, but tests show that this is not truly the case.